

Appl. No. 10/821299
Reply to Office action of 4/1/05
Page 5

REMARKS

Reconsideration and reexamination is requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Claims 1-2 have been amended. Claim 4 has been added. Claims 1-4 remain pending.

In the office action, claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Flewitt (U.K. Patent No. 320,242). Applicant respectfully traverses in light of the currently amended claims.

In addition, claim 3 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Flewitt (U.K. Patent No. 320,242) in view of Hayashi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,033,789). Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claims 1 & 2:

Claims 1 recites, among other features, a pair of link members, of which the lower end of each link member is rotatably supported by a bracket attached to the rear shelf portion of the vehicle. Claim 2 recites, among other features, a pair of first link members of which the lower end of said first link members being rotatably supported by a first bracket attached to the rear shelf portion of the vehicle. Further Claim 2 recites, among other features, a pair of second link members of which the lower end of said second link members being rotatably supported by a second bracket attached to the rear shelf portion of the vehicle. Flewitt does not disclose at least this feature.

Flewitt rather discloses "two pairs of parallel-motion links 3 and 4." (pg. 3, lines 69-70). However, Flewitt then discloses a link 3 "pivotally connected at its rear end, at 7, to a plate 8 fixed to the opposed edge of the opening in the roof of the vehicle." (pg. 3, lines 81-84). Flewitt then also discloses a link 4 with "its rear end ... pivoted to the rear end of the plate 8 fixed to the edge of the opening." (pg. 3, lines 90-92). Further, nowhere in the figures 2, 3, 6, 7 and 9 where plate 8 is disclosed, nor in the written specification does Flewitt disclose or teach link members of which the lower end of each link member is rotatably supported by a bracket attached to the rear shelf portion of the vehicle. Hence Flewitt does not anticipate claim 1 or claim 2.

Appl. No. 10/821299
Reply to Office action of 4/1/05
Page 6

Claim 3:

Claims 3 depends from and further limits claim 3, and is allowable along with claim 2 and need not be separately distinguished at this time.

In view of the above, Applicants' believe that the pending claims are allowable. Reconsideration and reexamination are requested. Any questions or concerns regarding this communication can be directed to the undersigned attorney listed below.

Respectfully Submitted,



Dated: June 28, 2005

Curtis B. Hamre
Reg. No.: 29,165
Hamre, Schumann, Mueller & Larson, P.C.
225 South Sixth Street
Suite 2650
Minneapolis, MN 55402
612.455.3800